

EXHIBIT A

Count	Cause of Action	Sub-claim	Judge Coleman's Decision (Dkt. No. 66)		Difference between FAC and SAC
			Standing	FAC States a Claim	
I	Lanham Act - False Advertising	"20% gratuity"	Yes (Decision 2-3)	No	Carved out of Count I (SAC ¶ 177)
		"standard taxi rates"		Sufficiently factual representation, but Plaintiffs must better identify a commercial interest (Decision at 5)	Cured: Specified Plaintiffs' commercial interests and how they are damaged (SAC ¶ 58)
		"premium" and "high quality" services		No	Carved out of Count I (SAC ¶ 177)
		driver licensing and insurance		Yes (Decision at 6)	--
II	Lanham Act - False Association	UberX insurance	Yes (Decision 2-3)	N/A	Added allegations relating to Uber's misrepresentation of insurance coverage for UberX (SAC ¶¶ 37-47))
		--		Yes (Decision at 6-7)	Added new allegations further demonstrating Uber's efforts to falsely associate with Plaintiffs (SAC ¶¶ 62-63)
III	Illinois Deceptive Trade Practices Act	--	Yes (Decision 2-3)	Yes (Decision at 7)	--
IV	Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Act	(see Count III)	Yes (Decision 2-3)	See Count III (Decision at 7)	Cured (see Count III)
V	Tortious Interference with Contracts	drivers' obligation to abide by laws	Yes (Decision 2-3)	Yes (Decision at 7-8)	--
		drivers' obligation not to associate with other brands/dispatch companies		Plaintiffs must identify the contractual provisions breached (Decision at 7-8)	Cured: Identified and quoted contractual provisions breached (SAC ¶¶ 105-06)
VI	Common Law Unfair Competition	(discussed collectively in the Decision)	Yes (Decision 2-3)	Yes (Decision at 8-9)	--